



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WESTERN PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

MAURICE DE WULF

POITIERS, FRANCE

In regard to Western scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages, every one repeats the laconic judgment, that it is "philosophy in the service, under the sway and direction, of Catholic theology." It could be nothing else; and it seems that one has said everything after announcing this clear-cut formula. This current definition, susceptible of the most different meanings, is found on the first page of a recent book, published during the War, on the philosophy of the Middle Ages;¹ and though the author gives a very mild interpretation of it, it is offered to the reader as an abridged thesis, in which one finds condensed all that is important to know on the subject. "Scholasticism is Philosophy placed at the service of already established ecclesiastical doctrine, or at least philosophy placed in such a dependence on this doctrine that it becomes an absolute Rule when both meet on common ground."²

Now this current definition of scholastic philosophy in the Middle Ages defines it very badly, because it is a mixture of the true and the false, of accuracy and of inaccuracy. It must be distrusted, like those equivocal maxims which John Stuart Mill calls "sophisms of simple

¹ Dr. Mathias Baumgartner. Friedrich Ueberwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Zweiter Teil. Die mittlere oder die patristische und scholastische Zeit. 10^{te} Aufl., Berlin, 1915.

² "Die scholastik ist die Philosophie im Dienste der bereits bestehenden Kirchenlehre oder wenigstens in einer solchen Unterordnung unter dieselbe diese auf gemeinsamen Gebiete als die absolute Norm gilt." P. 196. It represents the first and the general judgment of Baumgartner.

inspection," which by force of repetition enjoy a kind of *traseat* or vogue in science without being questioned.

To destroy the ambiguity we must appeal to history, and replace philosophy and theology in the midst of the civilization whence they have evolved. For this we must consider what results they had attained by the middle of the twelfth century in the classification of the sciences — the chief problem — and how these results harmonize with the general mentality of the epoch. (I) We must give an account of the rational distinction which writers of the thirteenth century establish between philosophy and theology, and the way they apply this distinction in their studies. (II) We must consider that in the thirteenth century it is a religious civilization in which philosophy and theology are developed and of which they are both factors, and that because of this sociological character certain relations arise between the two sciences. (III) By the light of these teachings of history, some conclusions will emerge that will show what is acceptable and what unacceptable in the definition before us, and what are its insufficiencies. (IV) These are questions of primary importance and of general concern, which we shall try to treat briefly.

I. RESULTS OF SCIENTIFIC WORK IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY

The twelfth century witnessed the civilization of the Middle Ages established in its definitive form. The struggles of kings with feudalism, the coming of the commons, the swing of commerce, the formation of citizenship, the freedom of the serfs — so many facts attest that the balance is being established among social forces. A new art is springing to life — the art of romance — and intellectual culture, always behind other factors of civilization, makes a considerable advance.

One of the most fertile results of the scientific work accomplished in the many schools that then covered the West, and chiefly the soil of France — where, as all agree, mediæval civilization was born — is that a distinction of frontiers between the different sciences is created and notably philosophy is clearly established outside the liberal arts, which it leaves *below*, with theology *above*.

It has been long supposed, and people still write, that philosophy in the Middle Ages was confused with dialectics (one of the three branches of the Trivium, with grammar and rhetoric); that it was reduced to a handful of dry quarrels on the syllogism and on sophisms. Some dialectical acrobats who in the eleventh and twelfth centuries emptied it of all content of ideas and rendered it bloodless and barren (“*exsanguis et sterilis*,” are John of Salisbury’s words), have managed to give this thesis a seeming foundation. But the truth is quite otherwise. These “*virtuosi*,” with their play on words and verbal discussions, were strongly combated; and men of worth — Anselm of Canterbury, Abelard, Thierry of Chartres, John of Salisbury, and others — not only practised dialectics or formal logic with sobriety and applied it in accordance with doctrine, but they placed philosophy by the side of and above the liberal arts and consequently above dialectics. Their writings touch the problems of metaphysics and psychology, which is matter quite different from formal dialectics.

While it hardly exists in the “*glosses*” of the Carolingian schools, philosophy rapidly progresses towards the end of the eleventh century, and in the middle of the twelfth century forms a considerable portion of ecclesiastical doctrine, which the following centuries were to make fruitful.

Now while philosophy has gained its position, the propædæutic character of the liberal arts becomes evident: they serve as an initiation for higher studies. Men of the

twelfth century take them into consideration, and the first who occupy themselves with the classification of the sciences express themselves clearly on this subject. Speaking of the liberal arts, "Sunt tanquam septem viæ," says a codex of Bamberg; they are, so to speak, the seven ways that lead to the other sciences — physics (part of philosophy), theology, and the science of laws.³ Hugh of S. Victor, Dominic Gundissali, Robert Grosstête, speak in the same sense. Here is a fact that settles the matter.

At the end of the twelfth century, the iconography of the cathedrals, the sculptures, and the medallions in the glass windows, as well as the miniatures in manuscripts, confirm this thesis. The philosophy which inspired artists is sculptured apart from and by the side of the liberal arts; for instance, at Laon and at Sens, and much more the window at Auxerre placed above the choir. The copy, still preserved at Paris, of the *Hortus Deliciarum* by Herrad of Landsberg (the original at Strasburg was burnt during the bombardment) places philosophy in the centre of a rose with seven lobes disposed around it.⁴

Just as the twelfth century clearly distinguishes the liberal arts from philosophy, so it established a complete separation between philosophy and theology. The establishment of this doctrine of scientific methodology is of the highest importance in the study in which we are engaged. The question of the existence of philosophy distinct from theology is, for philosophy, a matter of life or death, and we do not fear to say that it is definitely answered. But here also there are historical stages, and their study is fertile in teaching. The Middle Ages, in

³ "Ad istas tres scientias (phisica, theologia, scientia legum) paratæ sunt tanquam viæ septem liberales artes que in trivio et quadrivio continentur." Cod. Q. VI, 30. Grabmann. *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*. 1909. Bd. II, p. 39.

⁴ E. Mâle, *L'art religieux du XIII^e siècle en France*. Etude sur l'iconographie et ses sources d'inspiration. Paris, 1910, p. 112 et suiv.

the beginning, took up the Neoplatonic and Augustinian idea of the entire identification of philosophy with theology. Thus it is that J. Scotus Erigena wrote in the ninth century: "Quid est aliud de philosophia tractare nisi veræ religionis, qua summa et principalis omnium rerum causa Deus et humiliter colitur et rationabiliter investigatur, regulas exponere."⁵ But at the end of the eleventh century, and especially after St. Anselm had solved the problem of the relation between faith and reason, the distinction between the two sciences is practically accepted; and it is easy to see that St. Anselm, for example, speaks sometimes as a philosopher, sometimes as a theologian. The twelfth century advances a step further, and the distinction between philosophy and theology becomes one of its characteristic declarations. A codex of Regensburg of the twelfth century clearly distinguishes philosophers, "humanæ videlicet sapientiæ amatores," from theologians, "divinæ scripturæ doctores."⁶

I know well that besides these texts there are others in which philosophy is abused or misunderstood; that reactionary minds, narrow theologians or disdainful mystics, condemned profane knowledge as useless, or if they admitted philosophy, reduced it to the rank of a vassal and a serf of theology. In the eleventh century Otloh of St. Emmerau forbade the study of it to monks; they, he said, having renounced the world, must occupy themselves only with divine things. Peter Damien wrote of dialectics, that if sometimes (quando), by way of exception, it is allowed to occupy itself with theological matters and with mysteries of divine power (mysteria divinæ virtutis), it should renounce all spirit of independence, for that would be arrogance, and like a servant place itself at the service of its mistress, theology:

⁵ De divina prædestinatione, I, 1 (Patrol. lat. t. 122, 357-358).

⁶ Grabmann. Op. cit., I, 191. Cod. XII, 1. No. 14401.

Velut ancilla dominæ quodam famulatus obsequio subservire.⁷

Here for the first time this famous phrase is used. It is repeated in the twelfth century by a compact group of so-called rigorist theologians — Peter of Blois, Stephen of Tournai, Michael of Corbeil, and many others. The lofty mystics of the convent of St. Victor at Paris — Walter and Absalom of St. Victor — went so far as to say that philosophy is the devil's art, and that theologians who used it were "the labyrinths" of France.

But one must not forget that these detractors of philosophy were a minority, just as quibbling dialecticians formed an exceptional category, and that already in the eleventh and the twelfth century the best minds refused the unhappy phrase of Damien. St. Anselm had disavowed it. The Chartrains, John of Salisbury, Alan de Lille, expressly oppose it, or show by their writings that they reject it. Moreover, the speculative theologians who appeared at the beginning of the twelfth century and almost immediately formed three great schools — Abelard, Gilbert de la Porrée, Hugh of St. Victor — condemned these rigorous and timid writers, and the apologetic which they created (of which we shall speak further on) is the counterpoise to the tendencies of Damien. Peter Lombard himself, in spite of his utilitarian and practical point of view, rises up against such excessive pretensions. The formula is condemned by the majority of intellectual philosophers and theologians. Hence those are very unjust to philosophers of the twelfth century and the Middle Ages who follow the doctrines of a minority against which the best openly rebel. To go to the origin of the formula that philosophy is the slave of theology is to do it justice.

These considerations were necessary to raise the philosophy of the Middle Ages from that grave contempt which

⁷ De divina omnipotentia, c. 5 (Patr. lat. t. 14, c. 603).

weighed upon it too long on the ground that it had no *raison d'être* nor proper methods nor independence.

To say that philosophy by the twelfth century had become clearly distinguished from the liberal arts on the one side and from theology on the other, is to recognize that its frontiers are clearly marked. Now this great and first step by way of organization had been made at the same time by the other sciences, which in different degrees were all raised to independence. This same development took place simultaneously in dogmatic theology, which progressed rapidly, as we have just said, and threw out branches in the great schools of Abelard, of Gilbert de la Porrée, of Hugh of St. Victor, of Peter Lombard. It appeared also in the liberal arts, of which one or another branch was more especially studied in one or another school; for example, grammar at Orléans, dialectics at Paris. It was shown, moreover, in the appearance of new branches, as medicine, Roman (civil) law, and canon law. The great disciplines of the mind with which the thirteenth century was to be nourished, assert their titles to independence and their respective values; just as the functions of the king, of the great vassals, of the bourgeois of the towns, of the rural populations, are declared clearly in the political and social régime.

II. THE RATIONAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

A great fact dominates the history of the speculative studies of philosophy and theology in the thirteenth century — the creation of a unique and international centre, the University of Paris; a phenomenon, moreover, which was in strict harmony with the civilization of this great epoch, thirsting after unity and internationalism, which had only one faith, one code of morals, one

æstheticism, and one unique and dominant conception of life.

The University of Paris, the first university of Europe, issued from the schools of the Cathedral of Nôtre Dame at the end of the twelfth century, like a flower from its stalk, by the natural grouping of masters and pupils whose number had multiplied by the incessant development of studies. Henceforth in France and, one may add, in the West, Paris monopolized the development of speculative studies—philosophy and theology—and destroyed the concurrent regional schools. Two Faculties or groups of masters interest us: that of the philosophers (or artists) and that of the theologians. The sharp separation of the “personnel” of artists or philosophers and of theologians, is one of the first signs that the distinction of the two disciplines was clearly maintained. The University of Paris only took up the methodological classifications of the twelfth century, just as one finds them in the treatises of Dominic Gundissali, of Hugh of St. Victor, of Robert Grosstête, and many others. The tree of knowledge is cut in the form of a pyramid, with the particular sciences at the base, philosophy at the centre, theology at the summit. We shall show elsewhere that all the university programmes are dominated by this grand ideal. But what is new in the present situation is the reflective and reasoned study of this respective independence between philosophy and theology.

This independence rests on the difference in the points of view (*ratio formalis objecti*) from which they regard the materials with which they are occupied (*materia*). The scholastic theory of science is dominated by that principle of intellectual methodology which a man like Henri Poincaré would revive. In every science it is necessary to distinguish the things (*materia*) with which it is occupied from the point of view (*ratio formalis*

objecti) from which it contemplates them; and this point of view, which is the special good of each science, is always an aspect which the mind takes by way of abstraction in respect to the material. Thus the point of view of anatomy is not that of physiology; for though the two sciences are both occupied with the same matter—the human body—the first is only interested in the description of the organs, the second in that of the functions. Whence it follows that for the scholastics the distinction between the two sciences rests only on the divergence of their points of view, and the fact that they are occupied with materials with which at the same time other sciences are occupied is without influence. Physiology and anatomy, according to this theory, are as distinct as astronomy and civil law; in spite of there being, in the first group, a community of matters studied (the human body) which does not exist in the second group (stars and human actions). With this in mind, we can understand the declaration with which Thomas Aquinas opens his two *Summæ* on the *raison d'être* of theology outside the philosophical sciences (*præter philosophicas disciplinas*) and its distinction from philosophy. “It is diversity in the point of view of knowledge (*ratio cognoscibilis*) which determines the diversity of sciences. The astronomer and the physicist establish the same conclusion, that the earth is round; but the astronomer uses mathematical arguments abstracted from matter, while the physicist, on the other hand, uses arguments drawn from the material condition of bodies. Nothing then prevents the same questions with which the philosophical sciences are occupied, so far as they are known by the light of natural reason, being studied at the same time by another science, in the measure that they are known by revelation. Thus theology, which is occupied with sacred doctrine, differs in kind from *théodicée*, which is part of philosophy.”⁸

⁸ *Summa theologica*, 1^a Pars, q. I, Art. 1.

A contemporary of St. Thomas, Henry of Ghent, also maintains, in the beginning of his *Summa Theologica*, this doctrine, accepted by all the intellectuals of the time: "Theology is a special science. Though theology is occupied with certain questions touched on by philosophy, theology and philosophy are none the less distinct sciences, for they differ in the aim pursued (*sunt ad aliud*), the processes (*per aliud*), the methods (*secundum aliud*). The philosopher consults only reason; the theologian begins by an act of faith, and his science is directed by a supernatural light. "Adhuc philosophus considerat quaecumque considerat, ut percepta et intellecta solo lumine naturalis rationis; theologus vero considerat singula ut primo credita lumine fidei, et secundo intellecta lumine altiori super lumen naturalis rationis infusa." ⁹

It is easy to show that such principles were fully applied in the thirteenth century. Philosophers reasoned on the origin of ideas, on human liberty, on change, on the finality of nature, on the relations between will and knowledge, with many other arguments of the rational order. One would seek in vain a religious veneer or a theological *arrière pensée* to the solutions given, were it only for the reason that many come from Aristotelianism. Theologians discuss the holy Trinity, Redemption, the supernatural end of man, etc., and invoke the Scriptures. When certain matters are common to the two orders of study, as the existence and the nature of God, the point of view under which the philosophers and the theologians discuss them differs. Their arguments meet, like the rays of light which set out from distinct foci and are received on the same screen; but they are no more confused than — in our comparison — the luminous sources are confused. This is why numerous philosophic systems could arise, remarkable explanations of the world

⁹ *Summa theologica*, Art. VII, q. 1, Nos. 10-13.

and of life, capable of being judged and set forth as one sets forth and judges the philosophy of an Aristotle, of a Plato, of a Descartes, or of a Kant.

It is important to note that this distinction was universally recognized by men of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; and a proof that the public itself judged so is in the celebrated painting by Traini preserved in the Church of St. Catherine of Pisa, where the great artist of the fourteenth century has symbolized in drawing and in color all the intellectual movements of the time. What interests us especially in this picture, called the *Triumph of St. Thomas*, is the diversity of the sources by which the master is inspired, as he sits upon a golden throne in the centre of the composition, the *Summa Theologica* open on his knees. From the top of the picture Christ sends upon him rays of light, reflected by six sacred personages—Moses, the Evangelists, St. Paul—placed in a semicircle; then, further, by Plato and Aristotle arranged on the two sides on the same plan. Waves of brightness spread the doctrines over the world, whilst Averroës, in the attitude of one conquered, lies at the Saint's feet. This synthetic picture is a striking résumé of intellectual speculation in the thirteenth century, and gives the impression it made on men like Traini, who was placed in a position enabling him to see the master-lines. It teaches us that theology and philosophy occupy different planes, but subordinated like the personages who symbolize the one and the other; it shows us that both are joined, and complete each other in the work of a famous thinker whom the contemporaries of Traini called "doctor eximius." Moreover, the writers of the Renaissance and the Reform, so curt in treating of the Middle Ages, have clearly distinguished the scholastic theologians and the scholastic philosophers, reserving rather for the latter the name of scholastics: "Cum vero duplicem eorum differentiam

animadvertamus theologos alios, alios philosophos, quamquam illis hoc nomen potius tributum sit." This judgment, which I borrow from the treatise *De doctoribus scholasticis* of Busse, 1676,¹⁰ is confirmed by Binder Tribbechovius, and by all those who belong to that curious category of detractors and insulters of scholasticism, on whom Rabelais and so many others have founded their sarcasms. These "distributers of injuries" are better advised than some of our contemporary historians, for whom the speculation of the Middle Ages is a chaos, a hodge-podge of philosophy and theology, and who make the history of mediæval philosophy a department of the history of religions.

Not to understand the fundamental distinction between the order of nature and that of grace, between the rational conception of the world and the systematization of revealed dogmas, would be to misunderstand the speculative work of the Middle Ages, and to substitute arbitrary conceptions for the indisputable declarations of its greatest doctors.

III. THE RELIGIOUS SPIRIT OF THE EPOCH

The freedom of philosophy from dependence on theology rests then on solid methodological grounds. But while philosophy and theology are objects of speculation, we must not forget that both are living things and a function of the civilization in which they appear, the effects of which they feel. Hence they are marked by a whole series of sociological characteristics, and one of these characteristics is that they are both touched, but one more than the other, by the religious spirit.¹¹

¹⁰ Tribbechovius, *De doctoribus scholasticis et corrupta per eos divinarum humanarumque rerum scientia*. Giessen. 1665.

¹¹ I am preparing a new book on the sociological character of the mediæval philosophy. It will be a complement to my *Histoire de la Philosophie Médiévale*, of which subsequent to the English translation (Longmans, 1909) a fourth French (1912), a German (1913), and an Italian edition (1914) have been issued.

Could it be otherwise in an epoch in which Catholicism leaves its mark on all civilization? To judge of this impression it is not enough to turn to the *Golden Legend*, or the Apocryphal Gospels, which furnished food for the piety of the people. It is not enough to collect popular superstitions, the charges of satirists and preachers, the stories of Cæsar of Heisterbach. It is not enough to note the excesses caused by the veneration of relics, the conflicts between abbots and bishops, the bourgeois of the towns and the feudalists, whom material interests divided. These many oddities pale before the grand fact that the Catholic religion is the inspirer of the social state to the bottom of its structure, is the regulator of its morals, of its art, and of its thought. Statesmen the most individual — Philip Augustus or St. Louis in France, Simon de Montfort or Edward I in England, Frederick II or Rudolph of Habsburg in Germany, Ferdinand of Castile — all recognized the Catholic Church as the necessary foundation of the social state, even when their politics led them into conflict with the Papacy in order to shake off its patronage. The ardent faith which had aroused the Crusades sprang from the most diverse social strata — the new monastic associations of the Dominicans and Franciscans, who raise the level of belief and morality in the masses. Even the heretical movement that appeared in Languedoc, in Champagne, in Flanders, shows the vitality of the religious sentiment. In spite of the spirit of opposition to the Church, the century of Philip Augustus remains an epoch of Catholic faith.¹² By its dogmas and its morality Christianity penetrates everything; it gives a supernatural sense to the life of individuals, families, and peoples, who are all in the way (*in via*) which leads to a happy fatherland (*in Patriam*). In the corporation, work is a holy thing, masters are equal, art is allied to handicraft, the insti-

¹² Luchaire, *Histoire de France*, publiée par Lavissee, T. III, p. 318.

tution of the masterpiece guarantees the quality of the product. It is because one worked for God that the thirteenth century could cover, first the soil of France, then that of Germany, with gigantic cathedrals, chiselled like jewels.

There also shines out the intimate union between religion and beauty. The "*Rationale divinorum officiorum*" of Wilhelmus Durandus, Bishop of Meude, shows in detail that the cathedrals are at once marvels of art and symbols of prayer. The church of Amiens, which was the most perfect of the great French monuments, is a striking demonstration of the æsthetic resources of the original scheme. That of Chartres no less brilliantly exhibits its iconographic resources. Each stone had its language. Covered with sculptures, it presents a complete religious programme. It is for the people the great book of sacred history, the catechism in images. Consider Amiens or Chartres, Paris or Laon. Everywhere is underlined the function of a temple destined for the masses; everywhere our looks converge towards the altar, which sums up the idea of sacrifice. The frescoes and the glass windows of Giotto breathe forth the perfume of religious life; the poems of St. Francis, singing nature, raise the soul towards God; and Dante wrote to Can Grande della Scala, tyrant of Verona, that he wished by means of his poems to snatch away the living from their state of wretchedness and put them in the way of eternal happiness. Art, under all its forms, shows the unfailing bonds between religion and beauty.

The religious spirit that penetrated everything was bound to be felt in the domain of science, and notably philosophy. We shall find this question, so complicated and so badly understood, under new aspects, in the precise relations of scholastic philosophy and the Catholic religion. In what consists the tie between philosophy and the religious medium? and how can one reconcile

it with that doctrinal independence which philosophers so fiercely claim?

Conciliation is easy for a group of ties which I shall call exterior to philosophical doctrine, and which therefore cannot affect it. They are not less suggestive of the mentality of the time, and one can, it seems to me, reduce them to three classes, which we must examine briefly.

1. The first class results from the social superiority of the theologians; and this points to the fact that philosophy is for the most part a preparation for theological studies. That theology holds the place of honor in the complete cycle of studies ought not to surprise us, when every study, whatever it was, was subservient to the clerical estate. The thirteenth century in that only continued the traditions of the previous Middle Ages. The University of Paris, issuing from the schools at Nôtre Dame, counted only clerics among its professors, and these professors had strict relations with the Chancellor of Nôtre Dame and with the Papacy. Many were themselves canons, either of Paris or of the provinces or from abroad. Not to mention the Franciscans or Dominicans, who were the most brilliant masters in the University, the translation of Greek and Arabic works, whose revelation to the West was momentous, was due to clerks of Toledo or monks of Greece and Sicily. In short, all the workers of the Renaissance in the thirteenth century are ecclesiastics.

It is natural that the masters in the Faculty of Theology (*sacræ paginæ*) took precedence of all other masters, and notably of philosophers. In this, university discipline was only the reflection of social life. It is the intensity of Catholic life which makes us understand how these "artists" or these philosophers, after taking their degrees in the inferior faculty, desire in great numbers to undertake the study of theology. So much so, that the master-

ship of arts was a direct preparation for the grades of the Theological Faculty. So documents teach us: "Non est consensendum in artibus sed a limine sunt salutandæ." One does not grow philosophy; we must salute it at the threshold of knowledge and engage ourselves with theology. It is the intensity of this Catholic life which makes us understand how Robert of Sorbonne, founder of the famous college of that name, could, in the little treatise *De conscientia*, compare the Last Judgment to the examinations for the degrees of Paris, and pursue the comparison into a thousand details. In the supreme trial for the Doctorate, the judge will not be accessible to recommendations or presents, and all will pass according to the requirements of strict justice. It is, moreover, the intensity of religious life at that epoch which can explain certain controversies between theologians which subvert our modern ideas, like that on the subject of Christian perfection. While ordinary people are enthusiastic for religion simple and strong, the learned at Paris strove to know if the life of the regulars is nearer to perfection than that of seculars. Between 1255 and 1275 all doctors were obliged to declare themselves on this question. Certain secular masters treated it with an asperity and a passion which served as an outlet to their ill-humor against the Dominicans and Franciscans, whom they never forgave for having taken the three chairs in the Faculty of Theology. The religious themselves had similar discussions, and there is no more curious witness to this sort of jealousy than certain artistic works in the fourteenth century, as the Last Judgment of Fra Angelico, the Dominican, where we see some Friars Minor tumbling down to hell, while the Dominicans are received into Paradise.

If, for all these social and religious reasons, more credit, honor, and importance have been granted to theology and to religious discussions than to philosophy, the fact can

alter nothing regarding the position of philosophy, which remained what alone it can be — a synthetic study of the world by the sole data of reason.

2. The second class of ties results from the penetration of philosophy into speculative theology, and from its being constituted an apology for Christianity. The penetration affects theology alone, and philosophy not at all. Such was in fact this method, dear to the masters of Paris and called, currently but improperly by modern authors, the dialectic method in theology. We already know that speculative theology, to which the thirteenth century gave its brightest glory, is the coördination of Catholic dogma, and therefore its chief method is, and can only be, the authority of the sacred books. But by the side of this method, which is and remains the chief, theologians employed another accessory and secondary. In order to give dogmas an advantage over intelligence, they seek to show their well-founded reasonableness, as Jewish theologians had done in the days of Philo and Arabic theologians with the Koran. Abelard, Hugh of St. Victor, and Gilbert de la Porrée, in the twelfth century, founded this apologetic method, which attained greatest extension in the thirteenth. The same Thomas Aquinas, from whom we have learned to distinguish philosophy from theology, wrote on this subject, "If theology borrows from philosophy, it is not because it needs its help, but to place in a livelier light the truths it teaches."¹³

To apply philosophy to theology is what I call using apologetics. And as the application of mathematics to astronomy affects only astronomy, so the application of philosophy to theology affects theology. On this historical point, which I have long struggled to establish,

¹³ "Ad secundum dicendum quod hæc scientia accipere potest aliquid a philosophicis disciplinis, non quod ex necessitate eis indigeat, sed ad majorem manifestationem eorum quæ in hac scientia traduntur." (I^a, I, a, 5.)

writers of the thirteenth century support me, for they distinguish the two theological methods of authority and reason, "*autoritates et rationes.*"

It clearly results from this that the use of philosophy for theological ends arises by the side of pure philosophy, while this remains what it is. If one refers to the religious mentality of the thirteenth century, one understands how these applications of philosophy to dogma led away many minds, so that most philosophers became theologians, and mediæval apologetics rose under the most varied forms. In a social state like that of the thirteenth century, where heresies themselves sprang from an excess of religious zeal and under color of purifying belief, no one dreamed of opposing dogma but explained it in all sorts of fashions. The wisest, following the traditions of Anselm and of the Victorines, posited a reserved domain, the domain of mystery, for the advantage of theology. St. Thomas does not allow philosophy to demonstrate mystery, and only authorizes it to establish that mystery contains nothing irrational. Duns Scotus goes further, and for fear of a conflict withdraws from the empire of reason every theological question. But others did not follow these wise lessons. Raymund Lulli, as formerly Abelard, wished to support all the contents of revelation by syllogisms; Roger Bacon confused philosophy with apologetics. Mediæval rationalism, contrary to modern rationalism, which wishes to deny dogma in the name of reason, vindicates for reason the power of demonstrating dogma in every way.

Where does the profoundly religious spirit of mediæval speculation shine out better than in these rash attempts? It was religious even to folly, for there is no other word to characterize a third attitude, that of the Latin Averroists, who troubled so deeply the University of Paris in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Not wishing to deny either the Catholic faith or the compact mass of

philosophical doctrines in flagrant contradiction with this faith, they proclaimed the astonishing device of a double truth: "What is true in philosophy," said they, "may be false in theology, and vice versa."

Whatever be these different attitudes and the religious care which inspired them, the result was this pedagogic consequence — that the theologian, to make his apologetic application, would take up a crowd of philosophical questions; and as no science more than philosophy is stamped with the impress of him who treats it, each theologian kept and developed his philosophic tone of mind. Then, moreover, he experienced again the attraction of philosophic problems, or he had to refresh the memory of his hearers — "propter imperitos," says Henry of Ghent — and in both cases he made deep and prolonged incursions into the ground reserved to philosophy; so that philosophical work was at the same time used in the Faculty of Arts and in the Faculty of Theology, with disinterested preoccupation in the first and with apologetic in the second. This is the simple explanation of that deductive phenomenon peculiar to the Middle Ages which has perplexed historians so much — the mixture of matters philosophical and theological in the *Summa*, the quodlibeta, the quæstiones disputatæ, in almost all mediæval works. To consider only the title of *Summa Theologica* given to their chief works by Alexander of Hales, St. Thomas, Henry of Ghent, one would think they were large books in which philosophy had no share. Let there be no deception. Real treatises of pure philosophy are in these vast compositions. It will be enough in the work of St. Thomas to cite questions 75 to 90 (Prima pars) and the beginning of the Prima Secundæ, which respectively form easily detachable treatises of psychology and ethics.

3. The religious mentality of the time created a third class of ties, existing, not between philosophy and the-

ology, but between the subjective intentions of philosophers and the end to which they subordinated all their studies, which is no other than that of attaining happiness. The eye of all was fixed on the future life. As Dante wrote the Divine Comedy "to snatch the living from the state of wretchedness and to lead them to the state of happiness," so also the intellectuals of the thirteenth century refer their researches, whatever they are — astronomy, mathematics, the science of observation, and philosophy also — to their personal striving for Christian happiness. There was here no difference between them and painters, sculptors, or architects, who also worked for the glory of God and their own salvation, or even princes and kings, who were all moved by the desire of avoiding hell and of meriting heaven, and who did not conceal this in their official acts. But these intentions stood apart from their moral consciousness, and changed in no respect either the politics of kings or the beauty of works of art or the value of philosophical systems. Scholastics would have applied to their case the famous distinction of "*finis operis*" (or the work itself) and "*finis operantis*" (or the intention with which it was done).

To sum up: Neither the social superiority of theologians nor the constitution of theological apologetics nor the religious intentions of men of study were obstacles to the independence of philosophy.

4. There is a last class of ties of which it remains to speak, which touches very nearly on philosophic doctrine itself — the prohibitive or negative subordination of philosophy to theology. Profoundly convinced that Catholic dogma is the expression of the infallible word of God; convinced, on the other hand, that the truth cannot overthrow the truth, without overthrowing the principle of contradiction and involving all certainty in this ruin, the scholastics drew this conclusion — that philo-

sophical doctrine is forbidden to contradict theological doctrine.

To understand the precise meaning of this prohibition we must note: (a) That it is based on the law of the solidarity of truth. Truth cannot contradict truth. Music, which depends on the application of mathematical principles, writes St. Thomas, cannot go against those principles, and is not disquieted about their foundation; that is not its affair. Supposing the fact of a revelation—and in the heart of the Middle Ages no one doubted it—the attitude of scholastics is logical. Henry of Ghent wrote very precisely: “If we admit (supposito) that theological doctrines are true, we cannot admit that other doctrines can contradict them.”¹⁴

(b) We must note further that it is a prohibition to contradict and not a command to demonstrate. Thus a statute of the Faculty of Arts of 1272 enjoins on artists not to “determinare contra finem,” but does not tell them to “determinare pro fide.”¹⁵ No one applied this precept with greater broadness of view than Thomas Aquinas, and his famous doctrine on the eternity of the world furnishes a proof. The Bible teaches that God created the world in time. St. Thomas does not put the thesis that the world is eternal; that would be to contradict the dogma; but he goes so far as to say that its eternity would not be in opposition to its contingency, and thence that the idea of an eternal creature is not contradictory.

(c) It must be noted finally that this prohibition only touches philosophy on a *restricted* side of its teaching, for it holds only in regard to matters expounded at the

¹⁴ “Supposito quod hinc scientiæ non subjacet nisi verum . . . supposito quod quæcumque vera sunt iudicio et auctoritate hujus scientiæ . . . his inquam suppositis, cum ex eis manifestum sit quod tam auctoritas hujus scientiæ quam ratio . . . veritati innititur et verum vero contrarium esse non potest, absolute dicendum quod auctoritati hujus scripturæ ratio nullo modo potest esse contraria.” S. Theol. X, 3, No. 4.

¹⁵ Chartularium Univers. Parisiensis, ed. Denifle et Chatelain, I, 499.

same time by philosophy and theology. The statement has no weight where the two domains are not in question.

Having pointed out the theory of the scholastics on the subordination of philosophy to theology, we may discuss its value, and see if a like prohibition, however limited, trammels philosophical liberty. The answer would be different according as one accepts Christianity or not, and according to the meaning one gives to revelation. It is not this question that interests us here but a historical problem, and that brings us back to the point whence we set out.

IV. PUT TO THE TEST

The preceding considerations allow us to appreciate at its just value the current definition which served as a beginning of this study, and which Dr. Baumgartner reproduces at the head of his new edition.

First, one can say of scholastic philosophy that it is a philosophy of religious inspiration, in this very general sense, that it was evolved in a social atmosphere of which religion was the inspiring sovereign; that under the influence of this mentality theological studies enjoyed a social consideration superior to that which was granted to philosophical studies; that the neighborhood of faculties — theology and philosophy — introduced this curious mania for mixing — but not confusing — in the same book, philosophical and theological questions; finally, that in the order of moral intentions philosophy was regarded by the intellectuals of the Middle Ages as a preliminary step towards happiness. But this religious inspiration affects all the other activities that make up the civilization of the thirteenth century — politics, art, morals, family, work. The religious inspiration is a sociological characteristic by the side of many others;

but precisely because this characteristic belongs to civilization, it belongs to all its factors and is not peculiar to philosophy, which is only one factor. Hence it is not sufficient for the definition or judgment of philosophy. One could as well think of understanding the oak by describing the chemical and geological nature of the soil where it grows together with the elm, the beech, and other forest trees. One can understand that historians who study expressly the civilization of the Middle Ages, like Mr. Henry O. Taylor in his remarkable work, *The Mediæval Mind*, should criticise in the scholastic philosophy of the thirteenth century only its dominant preoccupation with salvation, which takes the lead of all subjects, and should think this its sufficing characteristic.¹⁶ But that works treating solely of the historical evolution of doctrines should be content with such a superficial judgment, seems to me inadmissible.

Besides the general criticism we have just made of this definition on the ground of insufficiency, some special criticisms come to mind as conclusions from the preceding study.

Scholasticism, they say, is "philosophy placed in the service of already established ecclesiastical doctrine." No. To place philosophy in the service of theology is to use apologetic; and apologetic, which proposes to show the rational character of dogmas fixed beforehand, comes from scholastic theology and not from scholastic philosophy. To define, according to the energetic idea of Aristotle, is to say what a thing is. Baumgartner-Ueberweg defines scholastic philosophy saying what it is not.

Is scholasticism then philosophy placed in such a dependence as to follow theology by absolute rule? Their ground is common. Yes; but the question is whether this limitation is enough to constitute a complete definition, and one that we have a right to expect

¹⁶ *The Mediæval Mind*, C. II, chapter 35.

in Dr. Baumgartner's work; and we answer in the negative. In the first place, because the limitation simply places boundaries or limits beyond which one cannot pass. It does not treat of what is beyond, or of a considerable number of philosophical doctrines in which theology is not interested, but in which Dr. Baumgartner's definition should be interested. To define is not only to trace the boundary where the territory stops, but it is to penetrate the territory itself.

We object further, because this limitation does not establish any doctrinal content, but simply forbids contradiction. It can only therefore establish a negative — that is to say, an imperfect — definition of philosophical doctrine, which is the thing itself to be defined. The strange thing is that Dr. Baumgartner does not deny this. He admits, in the notes or in some brief parts of his text, that scholastic philosophy extends to vast departments that do not enter the kingdom of theology.¹⁷ But he refuses to take account of them in his definition. Hence he excludes what is essential; he leaves out precisely what ought to be found there; he rests on a side-issue; he repeats barren formulas, and he perpetuates prejudices.

¹⁷ Even Mr. Henry O. Taylor recognizes that scholastic philosophers are devoted to the pursuit of knowledge for itself. Besides the joy of working for their salvation they have the joy of study. Men like Roger Bacon, Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas, could not have done what they did, says he, without the love of knowledge in their souls.